

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**JUNE 21, 2022**

Planning Board Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order.

***CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS:***

- a. Mr. Eickman began the Meeting with The Pledge of Allegiance.
- b. Mr. Eickman announced that the Upcoming Meeting Dates are:  
July 12, 2022, and August 9, 2022.
- c. Approval of Minutes of Meetings Held May 10, 2022:

**MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Craig Arco, to approve the  
Minutes of Meeting Held May 10, 2022. Voted and carried unanimously.**

- d. Roll Call: Members present were: Donald Papae, Craig Arco, Richard Campbell,  
John Eickman, Ed Miyoshi and Sarah Bledsoe. Member Lori Gee was absent.

Town Consultants present were Michelle Robbins, Town Planner, Thomas Wood, Esq., Town  
Attorney; Brendan Fitzgerald, Traffic Engineer, Peter Setaro, Engineer, CPL and Scott Bryant,  
Town Engineer.

Jackie Keenan, Planning Board Clerk was also present.

**SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING:**

- 1. **Montage Subdivision**, Route 52 (6556-00-802836)

Applicant is requesting to schedule a public hearing on **August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022** for a  
proposed cluster subdivision with 122 residential lots on a 385.5-acre parcel.

1       *Mr. Eickman made an announcement that the Montage Subdivision and the*  
2       *Summit Woods Subdivision will both have their Public Hearings held at the*  
3       *Planning Board meeting scheduled for August 9, 2022. He offered that, if there was*  
4       *anyone present for either of the items, he would give them an opportunity to speak.*  
5       *Otherwise, he said, it was not necessary.*  
6

7       **DISCUSSION:**

8       #10. **\*Summit Woods**, 3162 Route 52 (6656-00-045715)  
9

10           Applicant is requesting subdivision approval for a proposed 175 lot cluster  
11           subdivision plan located at 1326 Route 52.  
12

13       Andrew Gilchrist, Esq. was present.  
14

15       Attorney Andrew Gilchrist came to the podium stating that he was counsel for the Summit  
16       Woods project. For the record, and to refresh the Board, he said this was a project that has  
17       completed SEQR. It has gone through the adopting of the Findings Statement, which indicated  
18       that the public hearing for Summit Woods had been opened – but not formally closed. He said  
19       they would be happy to continue this on August 9<sup>th</sup> and to continue working with the Town on  
20       the infrastructure. He then thanked the Board and stated, as to the Montage project  
21       (acknowledging that Amy Bombardieri was present), that this would be the opening, as they  
22       adjacent projects.  
23

24       Mr. Eickman asked that the record reflect that this is a continuation of the Public Hearing.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

**EXTENSION:**

**2. #2021 – 007 Forestiere, 8 County Lane (6356-01-408655)**

**Applicant is requesting two 3-month extensions for a subdivision approved by the Planning Board on June 8, 2021 they are awaiting approval by the DCDBCH. Applicant previously received two three-month extensions thru June 8, 2022.**

Mr. Eickman announced that Forestiere was seeking two (2) three (3) month Extensions to their approval, which would be 6 months from June 8, 2022, to December 8, 2022.

**RESOLUTION EXTENDING FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL**

**NAME OF SUBDIVISION PLAT: FORESTIERE**

**NAME OF APPLICANT: Chris Forestiere**

**LOCATION: 8 Country Lane**

**GRID NO. 132800-6356-01-408655**

**Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman**

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant received approval for a 3-lot subdivision of a 4.34 acre parcel in the R-1 Zone on June 8, 2021; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant previously received two 3-month extensions of final subdivision approval thru June 8, 2022; and

1       **WHEREAS**, the applicant is awaiting approval by the Dutchess County Department of  
2 Behavioral & Community Health (DCDBCH) and is requesting two additional 30-day extensions  
3 of final subdivision approval from June 8, 2022 thru December 7, 2022; and  
4

5       **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby extends  
6 final subdivision approval thru December 7, 2022 for the above project as represented on a map  
7 “FORESTIERE SUBDIVISION” prepared by M. GILLESPIE AND ASSOCIATES,  
8 CONSULTING ENGINEERS, PLLC, dated March 31, 2021, and last revised February 26, 2021;  
9 and  
10

11       **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of  
12 this Resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a  
13 copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.  
14

15 Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member **Richard Campbell**

16 The votes were as follows:

17 Board Member Lori Gee	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
18 Board Member Craig Arco	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
19 Board Member Ed Miyoshi	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
20 Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
21 Board Member Richard Campbell	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
22 Board Member Donald Papae	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
23 Chairperson John Eickman	<b><u>Aye</u></b>

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29       **EXTENSION:**  
30

31       **3. Donovan Site Plan, 8 Nancy Court** (6358-02-561646)  
32

Applicant is requesting a 1 year extension for a site plan approved in 6/2/2009. The applicant previously received extensions on 4/6/10, 6/21/11, 9/6/11, 12/20/11, 3/6/12, 4/1/14, 4/21/15, 4/20/16, 6/6/17, 6/18/18, 6/18/19, 4/1/20, 11/1/20, a 6 month extension on 11/17/20 until 5/31/21 due to Covid 19 and a one-year extension on 6/8/21 thru 6/8/22.

Mr. Eickman stated that the applicant was requesting a 1-year extension for a site plan approved and that there were numerous other extensions granted for the matter. He proceeded to read the already prepared Resolution.

**RESOLUTION EXTENDING FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL**

**NAME OF SITE PLAN:** Route 376 Business Park Lot #3  
(aka Donovan Site Plan)

**NAME OF APPLICANT:** Route 376 East Fishkill Developers, Inc.

**LOCATION:** 8 Nancy Court

**GRID NO.** 132800-6358-02-561646

**Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman**

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant received site plan approval for a commercial building on Lot #3 of the East Fishkill Business Park on 6/2/2009; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant previously received site plan approval extensions on 4/6/10, 6/21/11, 9/6/11, 12/20/11, 3/6/12, 4/1/14, 4/21/15, 4/20/16, 6/6/17, 6/18/18, 6/18/19, 4/1/20, 11/1/20, an additional 6-month extension on 11/17/20 until 5/31/21 due to the Covid 19 pandemic and a one-year extension on 6/8/21 thru 6/8/22; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant is requesting two three month extensions of final site plan approval from June 8, 2022 thru December 7, 2022; and

1       **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby extends  
2 final site plan approval thru December 7, 2022 for the above project as represented on a map  
3 entitled "AMENDED SITE PLAN FOR LOT #3 - ROUTE 376 BUSINESS PARK", prepared by  
4 M. GILLESPIE & ASSOCIATES, PLLC dated July 24, 2008, and revised through March 6,  
5 2009; and  
6

7       **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of  
8 this Resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a  
9 copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.  
10

11 Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member **Rich Campbell**

12 The votes were as follows:  
13

14 Board Member Lori Gee	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
15 Board Member Craig Arco	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
16 Board Member Ed Miyoshi	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
17 Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
18 Board Member Richard Campbell	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
19 Board Member Donald Papae	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
20 Chairperson John Eickman	<b><u>Aye</u></b>

21  
22  
23  
24 **AJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:**  
25  
26

- 27       **4. #2021 – 019 – Hopewell EZ Storage Expansion, 896 Route 82 (6457-02-**  
28       **510638)**

29  
30       Applicant proposes to construct two new self-storage buildings 8,700 sf and 7,500  
31 sf in size. The buildings are proposed to be located behind the existing masonry  
32 building on the site.  
33

1 Michael E. Gillespie, Engineer, M. Gillespie & Associates Consulting Engineers was present for  
2 the applicant.  
3

4 **MOTION made by Sarah Bledsoe, seconded by Richard Campbell, to declare**  
5 **the Planning Board as Lead Agency. Voted and carried unanimously.**  
6

7 Mr. Gillespie displayed the plan and said it was a long time ago since he last met with the Board.  
8 He said there was a referral to the Dutchess County Department of Planning. It took some time to  
9 hear back from them and he said they had comments about the lighting, the impact on the Rail  
10 Trail and they have gone back and forth. The last meeting, they had, the County issued a letter  
11 stating there was a local concern, the matter is local jurisdiction. They no longer have any  
12 comments, and his understanding is that the Board was waiting to hear back from them in order  
13 to close the Public Hearing. He said that was his understanding and the biggest reason why the  
14 Public Hearing is not being closed and having been adjourned month after month after month. He  
15 said no one showed up at the Public Hearing, which was fine, He thinks this information now  
16 allows it to go to the next step. He said tonight he is looking for the Public Hearing to be closed.  
17

18 Mr. Eickman said they were prepared to close the Public Hearing and asked if there were any  
19 comments or questions before doing so.  
20  
21

22 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Craig Arco, to close the**  
23 **Hopewell EZ Storage Expansion Public Hearing. Voted and carried**  
24 **unanimously.**  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Mr. Eickman said there was a Negative Declaration and Resolution of approval and that the  
31 reasons for supporting the determination were the Environmental issues identified in Section A

as relevant: **Land Use and Zoning, Visual Character, Historic and Archeological Resources, Plants and animals, Transportation and Other.** He said he would not go through the entire Negative Declaration, but that the document would be available in the Planning Department for anyone wanting to review it. He further stated it has been determined there are no negative impacts.

**MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to adopt the Hopewell EZ Storage Expansion Negative Declaration. Voted and carried unanimously.**

**RESOLUTION AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL**

<b>NAME OF SITE PLAN:</b>	<b><u>Hopewell EZ Storage</u></b>
<b>NAME OF APPLICANT:</b>	<b><u>Excess Baggage, LLC</u></b>
<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b><u>904 Route 82</u></b>
<b>GRID NO:</b>	<b><u>6457-02-510638</u></b>

**Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman**

**WHEREAS,** Hopewell EZ Storage is an existing storage facility located in the I-2 zoning district;

**WHEREAS,** the applicant is applying for an amended site plan approval to add two new self-storage buildings 8,700 sf and 7,500 sf in size; and

**WHEREAS,** the two new storage buildings are proposed to be located side by side on the lawn area behind the on-site existing masonry building; and

**WHEREAS,** the proposed storage buildings were reviewed and approved by the ARC;  
and



1       **WHEREAS**, the proposed project is an unlisted action under SEQR and a short form  
2 EAF was prepared; and  
3

4       **WHEREAS**, a negative declaration was adopted by the Planning Board on June 21,  
5 2022.  
6

7       **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby approves  
8 the amended site plan for Hopewell EZ Storage Excess Baggage, LLC as represented on a map  
9 entitled "Hopewell EZ Storage/Excess Baggage, LLC," prepared by M. Gillespie & Associates  
10 dated September 30, 2021 and last revised October 29, 2021.  
11

12       **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of  
13 this Resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a  
14 copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.  
15

16  
17 Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member **Ed Miyoshi**  
18

19 The votes were as follows:  
20

21 Board Member Lori Gee	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
22 Board Member Craig Arco	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
23 Board Member Ed Miyoshi	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
24 Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
25 Board Member Richard Campbell	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
26 Board Member Donald Papae	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
27 Chairperson John Eickman	<b><u>Aye</u></b>

28  
29  
30

31 Mr. Bryant said he had a comment, stating he believed that, at one point, there was a Yield sign  
32 as one approaches the top of the hill, by Williams. He said it was talked about and he thought it

1 was installed. Mr. Gillespie replied that it is a Stop sign that has been out there. Mr. Bryant asked  
2 that this be verified, as he did not see that. Mr. Gillespie said he would do so.

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **DECISION:**  
9

10       **5.     #2021-012-Stormville Square, 194-198 Route 216 (6657-03-**  
11       **064313,066295)**

12               **Applicant is seeking Site Plan approval for a 36,000sq. ft. (formerly proposed**  
13       **as 21,400 sq. ft.) climate-controlled storage building on an undeveloped**  
14       **parcel located near the intersection of Old Route 52 and Route 216**  
15

16  
17 **Amy Bombardieri, Engineer, Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C. was present for the**  
18 **applicant.**  
19

20  
21 Ms. Bombardieri, displayed the plan and said that conceptual approval had been received from  
22 the D.O.T. since the last time this was before the Board. The exit on the north end of the project  
23 was eliminated and the entrance has been made less wide. She said the only outstanding  
24 comments are fairly technical in nature for the site.  
25

26 Mr. Eickman said that is correct and the only thing the Board was waiting for was the resolution  
27 of the D.O.T. matter, which has been accomplished on an acceptable basis. He asked if there  
28 were any comments from Members of the Board.  
29

30 Mr. Arco said he was reviewing the file earlier today and saw a question from the FAB about the  
31 location of the Siamese connection for the system. He asked if this had been answered. Ms.

1 Bombardier said she had just received those comments today and that they can be easily  
2 addressed for wherever they want it. Mr. Arco said they were looking for an answer and Ms.  
3 Bombardier said it could be wherever they want it.

4  
5 There were no comments from the Town professionals. Accordingly, Mr. Eickman proceeded to  
6 summarize the Negative Declaration, saying that it is an Unlisted Action. Environmental issues  
7 that were identified as relevant are: **Land Use and Zoning, Visual Character, Historic and**  
8 **Archeological Resources, Plants and animals, Transportation and Other.** The analysis of the  
9 issues identified and elaboration on the basis of the reason for this determination that there will  
10 not be significant impact on the areas identified in Section A is contained in the Negative  
11 Declaration. He stated that the document will be on file with the Planning Department for anyone  
12 who would like to review it.

13  
14  
15 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Craig Arco, to adopt the**  
16 **Negative Declaration for Stormville Square. Voted and carried unanimously.**  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 **RESOLUTION AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL**  
24

25 **NAME OF SITE PLAN:** Stormville Square  
26 **NAME OF APPLICANT:** Paleen Manor Corp.  
27 **LOCATION:** 194-198 Route 216  
28 **GRID NO:** 6657-03-064313, 066295  
29

30 **Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman**  
31

1       **WHEREAS**, the proposed action includes two existing parcels located at the intersection  
2 of Old Route 52 and Route 216; and  
3

4       **WHEREAS**, the applicant proposed to combine the parcels and construct a new 35,946  
5 sf climate controlled indoor storage facility; and  
6

7       **WHEREAS**, the existing commercial building on the western portion of the site will  
8 remain; and  
9

10       **WHEREAS**, an existing curb cut on Route 216 that currently services the commercial  
11 building will be eliminated and a new curb cut will be created to service both the new indoor  
12 storage building and the existing commercial building; and  
13

14       **WHEREAS**, the proposed storage building was reviewed and approved by the ARC; and  
15

16       **WHEREAS**, a public hearing was opened and closed on 1/18/22; and  
17

18       **WHEREAS**, the proposed project is an unlisted action under SEQR and a long form  
19 EAF was prepared; and  
20

21       **WHEREAS**, a negative declaration was adopted by the Planning Board on June 21,  
22 2022; and  
23

24       **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby approves  
25 the amended site plan for Stormville Square as represented on a map entitled " Stormville  
26 Square," prepared by Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C., dated 7/28/21 and last revised May 27,  
27 2022 subject to the following conditions:  
28

- 29           1) Resolution of comments in HVEA review memo dated June 20, 2022;  
30           2) Resolution of comments in CPL review email dated June 21, 2022;  
31  
32

33       **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of  
34 this Resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a  
35 copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.  
36

37  
38 Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member **Ed Miyoshi**

The votes were as follows:

Board Member Lori Gee	<u><b>Absent</b></u>
Board Member Craig Arco	<u><b>Aye</b></u>
Board Member Ed Miyoshi	<u><b>Aye</b></u>
Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	<u><b>Abstain</b></u>
Board Member Richard Campbell	<u><b>Aye</b></u>
Board Member Donald Papae	<u><b>Aye</b></u>
Chairperson John Eickman	<u><b>Aye</b></u>

**Mr. Eickman announced that the next item would be the Discussion for McDonald's (#8 on the Agenda).**

**DISCUSSION:**

**8. #2022 – 035 – McDonald's, 967 Route 376 (6358-02-570572).**

Applicant is applying for an Amended Site Plan to add a side by side drive thru and a Special Permit for a parking waiver to reduce the parking count by five spaces.

1 Matthew Ingber, of the law firm Brown, Altman & Dileo, Ethan Schukoske, from Atlantic  
2 Traffic & Design LLC, the project Traffic Engineer and Alex Lomei, from Bohler Engineering,  
3 the Civil Engineer, were present.  
4

5 The plan was displayed. Mr. Ingber introduced himself and stated Alex Lomei and Ethan  
6 Schukoske were present with him this evening. He said, since this was last before the Board on  
7 May 10<sup>th</sup> (2022), the scale of the application has been reduced. The application no longer is  
8 requesting a Special Permit for the number of off-street parking stalls. The original plan had  
9 originally reduced the parking stalls from 25 to 20 and this version of the plan takes into  
10 consideration the comments received from this Board as well as the Town Engineers. Four (4)  
11 additional stalls have been added and the parking stall count is now Town Code compliant. He  
12 said that this morning they received two (2) updated letters from the Town Engineer as well as  
13 comments from the Traffic Engineer. He said Alex Lomei was present to discuss the revisions  
14 made to the plan, as well as to address the comments received this morning.  
15

16 Mr. Lomei approached the podium, thanking the Board for having this matter back again. He said  
17 Mr. Ingber gave a big overview of the changes to the plan, which comes down to adding back  
18 four (4) parking spaces in order to comply with the Town requirement for parking. He said this is  
19 back to 24 parking spaces and he noted that there are 2 employee parking spaces on the plan, In  
20 the northwest corner, he said two (2) additional angle parking spaces have been added. He  
21 explained that the purpose of the two (2) employee parking spaces, initially when put there, was  
22 to help with the delivery trucks to give them the option of pulling out into the bypass lane. The  
23 purpose of them being employee parking and designating them is so that if there are deliveries  
24 scheduled, they can ask an employee to remove their car, stage the truck to do the delivery and  
25 unload, and the employee can move their car back at another time. He said this is so that there is  
26 an area for the truck to stage, unload and make the delivery. In the comment from the Traffic  
27 Engineer, Mr. Fitzgerald, he said there were comments related to the two (2) employee parking

1 spaces and deliveries by the truck and circulation was provided. Another option for McDonald's  
2 is that they would do the deliveries during the off hours, when the store is closed. Then, he said,  
3 there are no cars parked in the parking lot when there is more room to circulate the site and they  
4 can stage, make the deliveries. He said then there isn't the issue of trucks idling when someone  
5 needs to circulate the site in an emergency situation. He said he wanted to offer this to the Board,  
6 to stated that off hour deliveries could be done, so that there is nobody parked on the site when  
7 the truck is going to circulate. He said another item that was discussed in the Traffic Engineer's  
8 letter was a conflict near the drive-thru exit where there is the exit with the delivery truck and the  
9 existing curb line that is not changing. He said he could pull this up in order to present it. The  
10 program they use for the truck turning template is fairly conservative and he said sometimes there  
11 is a conflict. He has spoken with the operator of the truck and he currently has no issues making  
12 that turn. He said a video could be taken of this to demonstrate to the Board that the truck can  
13 make that turn, with circulation, If there are off hour deliveries, he said all the parking stalls on  
14 the north side would be empty and the truck would have more maneuverability to take a little  
15 wider turn and eliminate any sort of potential conflict with the existing curb by some of the  
16 outdoor seating areas. He added that, one of the new comments in Mr. Fitzgerald's letter was  
17 noting widening of the entrance where there is the right-only coming into the site. He said,  
18 pulling the curb back and widening the entrance will be just to allow, in the event that  
19 McDonald's is crazy busy at the drive-thru and there is queuing that comes back to the stop bar  
20 and the car could have a route to get around someone with the queue backing up and park. He  
21 said they could look at this and he is not opposed to that. If the Board authorizes off hour  
22 deliveries, he said that maybe they could relocate those and put them closer to the trash enclosure  
23 to get them out of the way and allow for in the event that there is queuing back to the Stop sign,  
24 and someone could sweep around and be able to park on the site. He said he thinks that was  
25 everything in the Traffic Engineer's letter.

1 Mr. Lomei continued, stating that he thinks all the comments from the Town Engineer, Mr.  
2 (Christian) Moore's letter. There was one comment about the septic system and he said they  
3 received historic plans from the site operator, for where the septic is located. He said they can  
4 certainly reference those plans, and plot them on these plans, so that it can be demonstrated  
5 where the curb line is and any clean-outs for the septic system. He concluded, saying he just  
6 wanted to update the Board with the comments from the professionals and to address any  
7 questions that the Board may have this evening.

8  
9 Mr. Campbell said that, originally the fact that this is a particularly busy site was discussed at  
10 length. In keeping with the deliveries, he said there is no way that any off-hour deliveries could  
11 be policed and, once there is approval, anything can happen here after that. Once a driver comes  
12 into the site, assuming it is a tractor- trailer being driven, and once the product is on the ground  
13 and the driver is off to the side, he asked if there was any crosswalk. If the driver takes the  
14 material and there is the queuing going on, how does the driver cross traffic from that point,  
15 where the deliveries are dropped on the ground to the interior of the building.

16  
17 Mr. Lomei said that McDonald's knows the process well and they use pallets; the pallets are  
18 brought and dropped at the back of the truck, off to the side. He said there is a situation with a  
19 hatched area behind the employee parking and the spaces where the pallets are dropped and they  
20 have everything set up. They get someone to get through the drive-thru, he said they would  
21 halt/put their hand up at the drive-thru and let the others know that there is someone about to  
22 cross. They take the pallets across fairly quickly, get in the building, do their unloading, it is  
23 moving again and there is no staging in the drive-thru circulation lane. When they do the  
24 unloading and come out, he said if there is someone taking orders, they will stand and let  
25 someone know that there is someone crossing, get back in their truck and leave, circulate out of  
26 the site. Mr. Campbell asked, if this process is taking place, what type of egress is there for fire



1 apparatus to gain access to the back side of the building. Mr. Lomei replied that, with the plans  
2 that are displayed, the truck would be standing in the employee parking spaces and if a fire truck  
3 comes in, they have the whole bypass lane where they can circulate around the building. If a fire  
4 truck is coming in with lights and sirens, he said he imagines that if anyone is in the way, they  
5 will move so the fire truck can access the building. Mr. Campbell said the only process then is  
6 the employee stopping the traffic and there is no identifiable cross area that would be specified  
7 for that person to cross and make the deliveries to the building. Mr. Lomei said there are specific  
8 crosswalks as it is not for pedestrian access in general and it is for the deliveries that come twice  
9 a week. He said they are generally pretty early in the morning, when it is a little less active. Most  
10 people are getting their coffee later than that, at the 5:00 a.m. time frame, and he reiterated that  
11 there is no crosswalk designated, which is pretty typical for the McDonald's across the area.

12  
13 Ms. Bledsoe said the proposals right now are that the deliveries would be in the employee  
14 parking. Mr. Lomei said yes, in the employees' spaces. Ms. Bledsoe questioned what happens  
15 when the delivery arrives; do the employees have to grab their keys and run outside to move their  
16 cars. Mr. Lomei said there are schedules and they would know that, at 3:00 on a Tuesday, or  
17 whatever the timeframe is, the employees would, prior to that happening, move their cars so the  
18 delivery can take place.

19  
20 Mr. Fitzgerald said his comment was that the employee parking be relocated to the southeast  
21 corner where they could be nosed in, next to the trash area. He said the area for employee parking  
22 could then just be hatched off for the delivery, which he thinks makes some sense. He said it is  
23 more practical and someone might park there inappropriately, a car might not start in bad  
24 weather, all kinds of things can happen. Ms. Bledsoe added that then the employees don't have to  
25 move their cars. Mr. Fitzgerald said he thinks it is more efficient with the 2 parking spaces and  
26 room in the southeast corner. He said it is just like when they put the 2 additional spaces in the

1 northeast corner; they can put 2 spaces in the southeast corner. Mr. Lomei said, where the  
2 employee parking spaces are now, they can be hatched out for loading. He said he would have to  
3 figure out how to do the layout but could certainly tuck 2 parking spaces back there. At that  
4 point, he said the spaces would not have to be striped as “employee only”, but he thinks it could  
5 be done just because of the location of them.

6  
7 Ms. Bledsoe asked what the parking requirement was for something like this. Ms. Robbins said it  
8 is 1space for every 150 sf building space for a fast food place. Mr. Eickman asked, if this is  
9 accurate, have they met the parking requirements. Ms. Robbins said the minimum requirements  
10 were met based on what she thinks was taking out the storage space and only the restaurant space  
11 was included. Mr. Lomei said No, it is based on 1 space for every 100-sf gross floor area. Ms.  
12 Robbins said it is 150 sf. Mr. Lomei said then if it is 150, the requirement would go down from  
13 the 24 that they are showing. Ms. Bledsoe asked if this includes outdoor seating space and Ms.  
14 Robbins replied that it is just the building space.

15  
16  
17 Ms. Bledsoe asked about the mobile parking spaces, saying some of these spaces are designated  
18 for mobile pick up orders, so are not really parking spaces, but standing stations. Mr. Lomei said  
19 they are for pick up. Ms. Bledsoe asked if this changes the parking requirement then, if these  
20 spaces are really designated; She said one can’t pull up and park in them. Mr. Lomie replied that  
21 said he would consider them parking spaces and is just going on what the Town’s Code is  
22 regarding the parking. He is open if there is a different interpretation for curb side pickup versus  
23 a longer-term parking space where one can sit and eat in the restaurant. Ms. Robbins said there  
24 are different changes going on with the parking for retail and restaurants in general. She is not  
25 familiar with the patterns here, but she said she heard from the Board that there are times when it  
26 is crowded and hard to find parking, especially on the weekends when the Rail Trail is full. She

1 said it sounds like people come over from the Rail Trail to use the outdoor seating area, but she is  
2 not sure if they are actually driving, or walking, at those times. Right now, she said, they  
3 technically meet the Code. Mr. Campbell asked what the reduction would be for 4 spaces. Ms.  
4 Robbins said that was originally, but based on their plans, they are not.

5  
6 Mr. Schukoske, traffic engineer, came to the podium, stating that when the parking study was  
7 done for this site, back in April, and when parking studies are done in general, he said it is  
8 inclusive of these mobile order stalls. Even though they are short term parking stalls, he said they  
9 are still included in the overall parking demand when they do a parking study. He said, before  
10 there were mobile order stalls, there was still the demand to go to this restaurant. Now, they stop  
11 and wait for someone to bring their order, where before they would still go to the site and park,  
12 go in, or possibly use the drive thru. When the parking study was done for this, he said they did  
13 the max demand of 16 parked cars, inclusive of the mobile stalls.

14  
15 Mr. Campbell said, at the last meeting, the Board had asked how many employees there were  
16 who would possibly be using some of these parking spaces. Mr. Schukoske said it is 13 on a  
17 shift, as per what the operator let them know; the parking study is inclusive of employee demand.  
18 While those are designated specifically as employee parking spaces, he said, for the possibility of  
19 loading in that are, it is obviously not the only area where they can park and they are welcome to  
20 park in the other locations.

21  
22 Mr. Eickman asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Members or Town  
23 professionals.

24  
25 Mr. Fitzgerald wanted to clarify one of his other comments, saying that they are certainly  
26 increasing the queuing potential for the site, from 9 to 13. Mr. Schukoske said it is 9 to 12

1 without impacting the circulation lanes. Mr. Fitzgerald said it is understanding the vulnerability  
2 of that, from his perspective, if the improvement is being made, then maximize the ability to  
3 handle the big fluctuations. He said he has been at this McDonald's and seen it jamb packed too.  
4 There are sports facilities that are in the proximity to this, and the Rail Trail, so there are things  
5 that get a lot of use. He said his recommendation was for widening the entrance and, right now, if  
6 there is a car stopped and waiting to get into the drive thru, that driveway is clogged and one  
7 can't get through. Widening that out would allow that car to come in to park, or to circulate and  
8 leave again; it would give them that capability. Mr. Schukoske said they would look at the  
9 geometry of that, but he would also point out what was talked about the last time. It is not just the  
10 capacity improvements, but it is the second ordering point, which would improve the efficiency  
11 of this drive thru and get people moving through it better. He said that has to be considered too.  
12

13 Mr. Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments and there were no responses. He  
14 said the next step for this project would be subject to satisfying Mr. Fitzgerald's comments on  
15 the next draft and then look to a public hearing.

16  
17 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Craig Arco, for a Public**  
18 **Hearing for McDonald's to be held on August 9, 2022. Voted and carried**  
19 **unanimously.**  
20

21  
22 Mr. Ingber asked if this application had been referred out to the County Planning Commission.  
23 Ms. Robbins said, to Dutchess County, yes. Mr. Ingber asked if comments had been received, as  
24 he has not seen any correspondence. Ms. Robbins said it would probably be soon.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

1 *Mr. Eickman stated, returning to the revised agenda, that the next item would*  
2 *be the Decision (#6) for Route 216/Phillips Road.*

3  
4 **DECISION:**

5  
6 **6. Route 216/Phillips Rd**

7  
8 **Resolution of no jurisdiction on land swap between town and property**  
9 **owner for new road ROW Route 216 and Phillips Rd.**

10  
11  
12 Mr. Eickman asked if there was no jurisdiction for the land swap between Town and Property  
13 owner and asked if there was someone who could explain this. Attorney Wood explained that, on  
14 Route 216 there is the sharp curve and, about 20 years ago when Four Corners development  
15 came in, the developer had to deposit some money to take care of improvements to this road. He  
16 said the Town was recently able to come to an agreement with the farmer who joins there, and he  
17 is willing to do a land swap with the Town of East Fishkill. The current part of Phillips Road  
18 would be abandoned and realigned so that the intersection is moved down as far as they can get  
19 it, below that curve. Because this is a swap of land with the Town, he said the Board does not  
20 have jurisdiction to go through the process to file the map with the County Clerk and there has to  
21 be a signature on it, indicating that the Planning Board has no jurisdiction and that is what this  
22 would be.

23  
24 Mr. Eickman asked if anyone from the Board had any questions. There were no responses and he  
25 proceeded with reading the already prepared Resolution.

26  
27  
28  
29 **RESOLUTION OF NO JURISDICTION**  
30 **(PHILLIPS ROAD AND ROUTE 216 REALIGNMENT)**  
31

Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member **John Eickman**

**WHEREAS**, the Town is undertaking a realignment of Phillips Road at its intersection with Route 216; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town is swapping land with an adjoining property owner dividing an existing parcel into four (1 existing, 3 new lots) lots; and

**WHEREAS**, since the action is at the behest of the Town it is exempt from formal subdivision review; and

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, the Planning Board Chair authorized to sign the map indicating that the planning board has no jurisdiction; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of this Resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.

Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member **Rich Campbell**

The votes were as follows:

Board Member Lori Gee	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
-----------------------	----------------------

Board Member Craig Arco	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
-------------------------	-------------------

Board Member Ed Miyoshi	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
-------------------------	-------------------

Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
----------------------------	-------------------

Board Member Richard Campbell	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
-------------------------------	-------------------

Board Member Donald Papae	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
---------------------------	-------------------

Chairperson John Eickman	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
--------------------------	-------------------

**DECISION:**

**7. 2021 – 013A - iPark Building A, 200 North Road (6456-03-958962).**

1           **Applicant is seeking Site Plan approval to for a 250,000 sf furniture distribution**  
2           **warehouse.**

3  
4           **Troy Wojciekofsky, Engineer with Stantec, was present.**

5  
6           Ms. Robbins stated that there was a Negative Declaration for this project and Mr. Eickman  
7           confirmed that, if there was going to be a Public Hearing, it would be for August 9<sup>th</sup>.

8  
9           Mr. Wojciekofsky came to the podium and introduced himself, saying he represented the  
10          applicant, Natural Resources. He said new materials had not been submitted for this meeting,  
11          however, since this was last before the Board, they had a meeting with the ARB. They had some  
12          minor comments, which he said are being addressed, and it is hoped that they will wrap this up in  
13          July. Another step they are hoping to take this week is with the Town Board, for a Special Permit  
14          due to the height of the building. He said it is approximately 50 feet and 430 is the maximum in  
15          the zone. It is his understanding that, before the Town Board can act on that decision, the  
16          Planning Board has to issue a Decision with respect to SEQR, the Negative Declaration. He said  
17          he was hopeful that could be achieved this evening so that this can move on to the next step. He  
18          said that was all he had this evening, unless the Board had any questions.

19  
20          Mr. Bryant said there had been questions at the last meeting that he was not sure if responses had  
21          been received. Mr. Wojciekofsky said No, they did not resubmit for this month's meeting, but  
22          that it would probably come in at the end of the month.

23  
24          Ms. Robbins asked if there was any further clarity on the canopy and Mr. Wojciekofsky  
25          responded Yes. He said a question had come up as to how much customer participation there  
26          would be on the site because of the loading area on the south end of the building and the canopy.  
27          Based on the applicant's discussion, he said there are very few customers who will come for pick  
28          up. He said they offer, essentially, assembled furniture and customers don't typically come to

1 pick up their furniture, it gets delivered. There is no showroom for the customers and very few  
2 customers would be on the site.

3  
4 Ms. Robbins asked if the parcel was leased and Mr. Wojciekofsky replied that he did not have  
5 that information, but he could find out.

6  
7 Mr. Bryant said one of the questions was how the customer co-exists with the commercial uses  
8 and how it is defined; is it a separate entrance or it is shared; how would they interact. Mr.  
9 Wojciekofsky said that, right now, on the current plan, signage is shown more geared for truck  
10 entrances and exits. He said at the last meeting, the addition of directional signage on the site was  
11 mentioned for employee, customer access, that sort of thing. He said it is something that would  
12 be included in the next submission.

13  
14 Mr. Eickman said there were actually quite a few questions, but that they would wait for the next  
15 submission; He said there were some things about trip generation, the maximum number of  
16 employees that would be there on a shift and a lot. He reiterated that the Board would look  
17 forward to the full report next time. Ms. Robbins asked if it all would be answered and submitted  
18 within the timing for a public hearing, or should the Board be considering pushing the public  
19 hearing to September. She said it is not a lot of time and it has to be advertised 20 days before.  
20 Mr. Wojciekofsky asked the date of the public hearing and Ms. Robbins replied August 9<sup>th</sup>; that  
21 it would have to be published in the newspaper and by the beginning of July when everything  
22 would have to be received. Mr. Eickman said then the next submission would be by July 12<sup>th</sup> and  
23 Mr. Wojciekofsky said that was their intention, to submit it at the end of this month, for July.

24  
25  
26 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Donald Papae, for a**  
27 **Public Hearing for iPark Building A to be held on August 9, 2022. Voted and**



1                   **carried unanimously.**

2  
3  
4 Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed with Mr. Wojciekofsky that he was intending to submit for the July  
5 meeting.

6  
7 Mr. Eickman said the Negative Declaration shows a proposed action as unlisted and is in the  
8 Town of East Fishkill, Dutchess County, at 200 North Drive, in Hopewell Junction, New York.  
9 He read from the Negative Declaration that the environmental issues identified as relevant were:  
10 **Land Use and Zoning, Visual Character, Historic and Archeological Resources, Plants and**  
11 **animals, Transportation and Other**, the details of which are further defined in the Negative  
12 Declaration and read by Mr. Eickman, as follows:

13  
14 **Land Use and Zoning, Public Policy:**

15 “The proposed action would result in the redevelopment of an existing parking area on the iPark  
16 property to a 253,800 sf furniture warehouse with 15,000 sf of office space and a 4,800 sf canopy  
17 for customer pick-up. The site would contain 223 car parking spaces, 65 loading spaces, 76 truck  
18 spaces and 11 container spaces to service the Building A (furniture warehouse). In addition, a  
19 satellite parking area with 106 spaces separate from the Building A parking area is provided to  
20 serve the existing Building 700 since Warehouse A is proposed to be constructed within the  
21 existing Building 700 parking area. Additional handicapped spaces for Building 700 have also  
22 been provided immediately adjacent to the building. The proposed project would be constructed  
23 entirely within the existing developed area of the industrial iPark campus and no undeveloped  
24 land would be disturbed. The proposed use would be consistent with the existing industrial and  
25 commercial zoning and the Town’s Comprehensive Plan and Industrial Lands Study which  
26 shows the former IBM campus as remaining industrial/commercial. Therefore, the proposed

1 project would not be expected to result in any significant adverse impacts to Land Use, Zoning,  
2 or Public Policy.

3  
4 **Visual Character:**

5 The proposed project would result in the construction of a new 258,300 sf warehouse with  
6 associated parking. The proposed new building would appear industrial in character and would  
7 be consistent with the character of the existing iPark Campus. The proposed new structure would  
8 only be visible from the interior iPark Campus roadways and would not be visible from iPark  
9 Boulevard, Route 84 or any surrounding residential, commercial, or industrial properties not part  
10 of the iPark campus. Therefore, the proposed project would not be expected to result in any  
11 significant changes to visual character and no significant adverse visual impacts are expected.

12  
13 **Historic and Archeological Resources:**

14 The proposed project would be constructed within a location that has been previously disturbed  
15 and is not expected to impact historic or archeological resources. Therefore, no significant  
16 adverse impacts to historic or archeological resources would be expected.

17  
18 **Wetlands, Plants, and Animals:**

19 The proposed action would be constructed entirely within an existing paved parking area on the  
20 iPark Campus. No tree removal or disturbance to undeveloped areas would occur as a result of  
21 the proposed project. While the existing parking area where Building A is proposed is partially  
22 located in a NYSDEC 100-foot adjacent area, the site was formerly part of the IBM industrial  
23 campus and has been disturbed and covered with impervious surfaces since before 1970.  
24 Therefore, the proposed project would not be expected to result in any significant adverse  
25 impacts to wetlands, plants and other animals.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**Transportation:**

Based on the proposed site generated traffic, the applicant consents and agrees to inclusion in the Route 52 Traffic Improvement Area Assessment in coordination with the Town and NYSDOT. Therefore, the proposed action would not have any significant adverse impacts to transportation.

**Other**

No other significant potential impacts were identified as a result of the Proposed Action.

Mr. Eickman further read from the document that THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS AUTHORIZED AT A MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL HELD ON JUNE 21, 2022.

**MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to adopt the Negative Declaration for iPark Building A.  
Voted and carried unanimously.**

**DISCUSSION:**

**9. #2022 – 032 – Cim Tech, 40 Corporate Park Drive (6356-04-525017).**

Applicant is looking to construct a 6,400 sf addition to existing building.

1  
2 Stephen A. Whalen, Whalen Architect, PLLC, Steven Teed, one of the owners, and  
3 Brian Hildenbrand, Civil Engineer were present.  
4

5 The plan was displayed, and Mr. Whalen stated that the proposal is for a 6,400 sf addition on the  
6 northeast side of the existing building. The additional space is really for fabrication. Since the  
7 last presentation, he said there is an updated survey, prepared by Jonathan Millen, which shows  
8 the correct property lines and all the site features have been updated. The existing parking, the  
9 proposed parking and drainage have been updated and they are also in receipt of recent  
10 comments from Christian Moore, from CPL that he said will be addressed. Limited disturbance  
11 is now shown on the civil drawings and maneuver path, which he said Brian would speak to  
12 more. This has been to the ARB and approval received. On the zoning analysis, he said this  
13 complies with ZBA requirements. Mr. Whalen turned over to Mr. Hillenbrand to address more  
14 about the drainage and tractor turn maneuver.  
15

16 Mr. Hildenbrand came to the podium stating he would walk through the turning maneuver, the  
17 rear parking area that exists today. The existing curb island will be removed, which will allow  
18 the standard tractor trailer to enter the site, maneuver around and be able to back into the loading  
19 dock, which will be on the new building addition. From there, he said the truck can exit the  
20 property without encroaching on any existing spaces, without hitting any structures or plants.  
21 They were able to do this without enlarging the parking lot and there is no increase in  
22 impervious. The existing drainage that exists in the parking lot now will be reconfigured to  
23 essentially collect the entire parking lot and convey the water to where it goes today. He said  
24 there is no dirt removal and the only disturbance is in the existing asphalt as it is today.  
25

26 Mr. Eickman asked if there were any comments or questions from the Board Members of  
27 Professionals and there was no response. He asked Mr. Hildenbrand if they would be prepared

1 for a public hearing if it were to be scheduled for August 9<sup>th</sup>, and he replied Yes. Ms. Robbins  
2 said if this could be moved to September, as it was already going to be a very long evening with  
3 many items. Mr. Whalen asked when everything would have to be to the Planning Board office.  
4 Ms. Robbins replied that it would have to be noticed 20 days before a public hearing is held and  
5 there weren't really any changes to be made with this plan relatively set. Mr. Hildenbrand stated  
6 that the sooner this could be accommodated, the better.

7  
8 **MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to schedule a Public**  
9 **Hearing to be held for Cim-Tech on August 9, 2022. Voted and carried**  
10 **unanimously.**

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 **DISCUSSION:**

17 **11. #2022 – 037 – Firas Bridges Subdivision, Eder Road (6656-00-**  
18 **819763)**

19  
20 Applicant is seeking subdivision approval for a proposed 4 lot subdivision with  
21 one existing building lot currently under construction.

22  
23 Amy Bombardieri was present.

24  
25 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to**  
26 **Declare the Planning Board Lead Agency. Voted and carried unanimously.**  
27

28  
29 Ms. Bombardieri came to the podium, stating that this is a proposed 4-lot subdivision with a  
30 home currently constructed on the proposed Lot 2. The proposed Lot 1 is the lot above the flag  
31 full portion driveway, and she said the other 2 parcels, #3 and #4, proceed south. Responses have  
32 been received from SHIPPA and there are no impacts, no wetlands and the steep slopes are being  
33 avoided. The habitat have come back and she said that cutting obviously has to be avoided during

1 the summer months. The Health Department review is underway for Lot 2 to redesign, relocate  
2 the expansion area for the septic system and she said the soil tests for the other 3 lots will be  
3 submitted to the Health Department momentarily.

4  
5 Mr. Eickman asked if there were any comments from the Board Members or Professionals. Mr.  
6 Bryant said he had been to the site and that it is rough site, rocky. Ms. Bombardieri said steep,  
7 Mr. Bryant said it was stated that there are no steep slope encroachments but asked if they were  
8 sure of this. Ms. Bombardieri said she does not think there are. Potential for the driveway for Lot  
9 1. Mr. Bryant said it is rough site, not wet and no floodplain but it is very rocky. Mr. Setaro said  
10 that the driveways was also one of his comments because they are at the beginning and in a cut  
11 section and the transitions as one comes in off of the road would have to be looked at, and the  
12 grade values at the curbs. He asked if they had the Highway Superintendent out yet. Ms.  
13 Bombardieri responded yes, she believes he met with Brian at the site. She said adjustments  
14 would have to be made and they are encroaching on some steep slopes on the lot line for the  
15 driveway, with the grade angle. Mr. Setaro asked if it was thought there would be sight line  
16 easements, to clear for sight lines. Ms. Bombardieri replied that they may be needed, as well as a  
17 temporary grading easement for Lots 1 and 2, for the driveways.

18  
19 Mr. Bryant questioned if this was in a watershed, saying it is way off the watershed and Ms.  
20 Bombardieri said it is not in the watershed.

21  
22 Ms. Robbins asked if there were comments from the FAB, thinking there may be a pull off  
23 wanted and Ms. Bombardieri said that is done; they do have the pull-offs and a turnaround is  
24 halfway up.

1 Ms. Robbins referred to the SEQR and said one of the Lots is currently in construction right now.  
2 To avoid segmentation, she said discussion was needed of that Lot as part of the SEQR for the  
3 whole subdivision. Ms. Bombardieri said it was not mentioned. Ms. Robbins said, when looking  
4 at the Stormwater, these are a disturbance. Ms. Bombardieri said that they are also disturbing less  
5 than 5 acres, for the record, and that a SWPPP would be needed.

6  
7 Mr. Arco asked if there is domestic water and Ms. Bombardieri said No.

8  
9 Mr. Eickman asked if there were any further comments.

10  
11 Ms. Bombardieri said they would like to schedule the public hearing and it would need to be  
12 circulated 30 days before. If it was for August 9<sup>th</sup>, Ms. Robbins said it would have to be in to  
13 them by the next day. The September Planning Board meeting is scheduled for the 13<sup>th</sup>. Ms.  
14 Robbins reviewed the items on the August 9<sup>th</sup> agenda, saying Montage and Summit were on,  
15 which could take quite a while, besides Cim-Tech, Ipark, Ms. Bombardieri asked about the  
16 September meeting because of SEQR, and the 30 days and it was agreed that would work best.

17  
18  
19  
20 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, for a**  
21 **Public Hearing to be scheduled for Firas Bridges Subdivision on September**  
22 **13, 2022. Voted and carried unanimously.**  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**DISCUSSION:**

12. **#2022-038 - iPark– Sloop Brewery**, 700-740 South Drive (6456-030-047060)

Applicant is seeking approval of a proposed outdoor patio with a wood framed structure and outdoor seating.

Thomas (“Ted”) Nitza, P.E., Walden Environmental Engineering and Justin Taylor, Co-Founder for Sloop Brewery were present.

The plan was displayed and Mr. Nitza stated that the plan was for the expansion of the outdoor eating and enjoyment area, with a patio and wood framed pergola that goes over the top of it. The entire patio area is planned for 20 ft x 160 ft and he said the covered portion is small, 20 ft x 100 ft. He said there will be a 70 ft x 12 ft part for storage of equipment and that the rest will be open for the patio. He said this is at the iPark industrial complex, right next to the existing Sloop facilities and it is reusing/repurposing existing areas there. There are some adjustments to the parking lot that were brought to their attention when meeting with the engineer onsite after the application. There were comments from the ZBA about signage, which he said was addressed earlier this day. He said he has both the parking adjustment and more ADA ramps and parking spaces, as well as the signage requests made on separate sheets. He concluded his opening by asking if there were any comment or questions at this time.

Mr. Campbell asked if it could be seen where this abuts, and it was displayed for viewing. Mr. Nitza said the dark space displayed was the patio area and to the left was the existing Sloop building. To the top and bottom are the parking areas that straddle the grass area. Mr. Miyoshi asked if this was going where the tent is now. He said he heard at one point that there would be a tasting area going out towards the Visitor’s Center and asked if that would impact the placement



1 of this. Mr. Nitza responded that the Visitor Center was operated by the Sloop, which has been a  
2 vendor, a kiosk of those events that have been taking place there from time to time but that it is  
3 not permanent space; it is a temporary rented type of space.

4  
5 Mr. Campbell said, based on the removal of the tent, and the structure being put there, questioned  
6 if there was anything blocking the cars from coming towards it. Mr. Nitza responded that this  
7 was a very good question and that he appreciated it being asked. He said when this project was  
8 first brought in an effort to make the space permanent, one of the concerns was the parking areas.  
9 This was addressed in an earlier submittal with the guard rails for the entire length but then after  
10 the submittal, they met with Mr. Bryant there. This was switched to a number of concrete  
11 bollards, to hold the handicapped or no parking signs to give space. Then, as it gets towards the  
12 patio area, he said this transitions to a guard rail arrangement, which is shown on the drawings that  
13 he would be bringing up next, in response to what Mr. Bryant was asking for when they met on  
14 the site. Mr. Campbell asked the approximate distance from the bollards to this structure, the  
15 bollards and building and said if there were any spillover, that would come outside of the  
16 structure. Mr. Nitza responded that there was not a lot of distance, there is already curb and  
17 sidewalk. He said a portion of this can be seen where it would be for handicapped stalls, along  
18 the curb line and along the edge of the southern edge of the sidewalk on the north. Mr. Campbell  
19 asked him if he anticipated that the use would be strictly for the product, and the food, or would  
20 there be entertainment there. Mr. Nitza replied that there is nothing for the structure of what the  
21 extensive use may be; as to the band, there are those sorts of things inside, and this is not wired  
22 for concert sound or anything like that. It is more of an outdoor environment.

23  
24 Mr. Nitza displayed another portion of the plan. Mr. Bryant explained that when he went there,  
25 he offered the bollards as an option, not necessarily a requirement, but there needed to be  
26 something to prevent vehicles from crashing into it. Mr. Campbell said that was a better choice

1 as people could step through them, rather than over a guard rail. Mr. Bryant said there is ample  
2 reveal on the curb line and there are some areas that are deteriorated, and need to be repaired, and  
3 whether or not the handicapped parking can be incorporated to make use of those areas, with the  
4 new ramps in. The bollards were a suggestion. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that a bollard needed to go  
5 in the hatched area between the handicapped spots. He referred to the open area.

6  
7 Ms. Bledsoe asked if the ramp that comes off of the parking lot, into the door, that is currently  
8 there will be staying. Mr. Nitza said it is staying and that one of the things on the opposite side is  
9 that there is no ADA ramp. He said there is ADA in spots, but no ramp, so they have added the  
10 installation ramp so that it can get to the ramp. Ms. Bledsoe questioned if, in order to get out of  
11 the building, one has to walk down the ramp and into the parking lot. Mr. Nitza said Yes, the  
12 metal structure would still be there, unchanged. Ms. Bledsoe said she's assuming the food will  
13 come from the kitchen inside, to the outside, and will have to walk into the parking lot, around  
14 and into the building. Mr. Nitza explained that he was there several times when it was a tent and  
15 one came out a side door. Mr. Bryant said yes, he does not think one would need to walk through  
16 the parking lot with food. He said one would go from the parking space, off the one ramp, to get  
17 to the aluminum ramp, and then one is outside of the parking area. He added that this is in line  
18 with where the pavilion is going, so he does not believe one would have to walk through the  
19 parking lot. Ms. Bledsoe said, but the ramp goes right into the edge of the parking lot. She had a  
20 picture of it where she described that the ramp comes down to the parking lot and one would  
21 have to walk over the grass. Mr. Bryant said that was not his recollection, but that he would take  
22 a look at that. Mr. Nitza said if one is going up the ramp, to the door, around that door, there is  
23 another corner, concrete step way, that goes to the concreted sidewalk, and leads there. Ms.  
24 Bledsoe said then the intention is for employees, and whomever else, to come out the side and to  
25 come down that way. Mr. Nitza said he did not know if that was the intent, or if it would end up  
26 happening; it wasn't a structure before when it was a tent but, dual pathways are still there. Ms.

1 Bledsoe said she would have concerns with people walking into the parking lot, or at least  
2 adjacent to the main ramp, into the main entrance.to use the bathroom, just go inside, whatever.  
3 She said it seems more of a natural path to get inside and more safe. Mr. Bryant reiterated that he  
4 would go out and take a look and told Ms. Bledsoe that he agrees with her.

5  
6 Ms. Robbins said she would assume there is no food preparation in the actual structure. Mr.  
7 Nitza said there would be a refrigerator, coolers storage, but that it is not expected to be food  
8 prep.

9  
10 Mr. Arco confirmed that there would be no open flame.

11  
12 Mr. Eickman asked if there had been discussion about storage of biproducts of the brewing  
13 process and said Mr. Bryant had noted this at one time. Mr. Bryant said when he was there, he  
14 had addressed his concern with the vessel being used to temporarily store decan. He said he  
15 knows they are meeting with Global Foundry this week or next about some sewer issues and his  
16 intent is to bring this up, so that everyone is on the same page with the methodology. Mr. Nitza  
17 told Mr. Bryant that he had reached out to them the day they met there, and he was not sure if he  
18 heard back. Mr. Bryant said there had been a change of personnel. Mr. Nitza said the decan, other  
19 than the screened area that was planned as part of this 9 ft tall patio are that the production  
20 process has not changed with this application. Mr. Bryant said there was leeching from a vessel,  
21 like a dump truck, in his opinion, running along a curb line to a storm drain. It was said they were  
22 going to address this in some fashion and he wants to be sure it was done properly, as part of this;  
23 not to mention the odor. Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Nitza if this is something they would be  
24 working on. He replied that, with the pavilion, there is a sanitary sewer drinking water electric  
25 system that comes out there and the sewer drainage is intended to address that issue also, with  
26 Global Foundry's permission.

1  
2 Mr. Campbell asked if the proposed structure was all wood and Mr. Nitza replied Yes, it is. He  
3 said the columns are a native timber, from the site and the rest will be timbers, commercial grade  
4 trusses applications. He said the coloring is using Sloop's branded colors.

5  
6 Ms. Bledsoe asked if there were any tables in, or just seats at the bar. Mr. Nitza showed on the  
7 plan the layout of where there were tables. Ms. Bledsoe said there are a lot of tables.

8  
9 Ms. Robbins said it is up to the Board whether or not this would be considered a minor site plan  
10 amendment and, if so, the requirement for a public hearing can be waived and it would be by  
11 vote. Mr. Eickman asked the Members if a public hearing was needed. Ms. Bledsoe commented  
12 that the tent is already there, the concrete there. The Members agreed it was not needed and Mr.  
13 Eickman said then the public hearing could be waived.

14  
15 Mr. Campbell asked about the conditions that Mr. Bryant mentioned. Mr. Setaro said there were  
16 also comments that would have been received this day and he asked if they had been received  
17 from Chritian. Moore. Mr. Nitza said they were for the Visitor's Center. Mr. Setaro apologized,  
18 saying they had major server issues the pasts week. He said there had also been email comments  
19 and gave them to Mr. Nitza, saying that they were minor. He wanted to note that there was  
20 mention of a 10 ft high retaining wall. Mr. Nitz said it is for screening of the truck that was  
21 mentioned earlier and, based on comments received, this was reduced to 9 ft. Mr. Setaro said the  
22 details of this would be needed. Mr. Bryant added that it is not really a retaining wall, but a visual  
23 screening.

24  
25 Ms. Robbins referred to the motion to be approved, based on discussion this evening by the  
26 Town Engineer and the CPL email comments dated 6/21/22.

1  
2 Mr. Nitza said there were also the sign issues that were addressed, and Mr. Fitzgerald said that it  
3 was about the size of the signs and this was provided.  
4  
5  
6

7 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to waive that a**  
8 **Public Hearing be held, based on discussion this evening by the Town Engineer**  
9 **and CPL email comments dated 6/21/22, and to approve the project by voice vote.**  
10 **Voted and carried unanimously.**  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 **DISCUSSION:**  
22  
23  
24

25 **13. #2020-008 iPark Visitors Center, iPark Blvd and South Drive (6456-**  
26 **03-047060)**  
27

28 Applicant is proposing to amend the resolution to the iPark visitor's site plan  
29 approval dated 8/18/2020 to increase the size of the Jane Bakes addition from 883  
30 sf to 2500 sf and remove the entry porch to the southwest corner of the building.  
31  
32  
33

34 Thomas ("Ted") Nitza, P.E., Walden Environmental Engineering was present.  
35

1 While the plan was being displayed, Mr. Eickman read the description of the item, stating that  
2 the Applicant is proposing to amend the resolution to the iPark visitor site plan approval dated  
3 8/18/2020 to increase the size of Jane Bakes addition from 883 sf to 2500 sf and remove the  
4 entry porch to the southwest corner of the building.

5  
6 Mr. Nitza came to the podium, stating that he was going to ask for Ms. Robbins' help in him  
7 explaining what is being proposed this evening. His understanding is it is just the 2 sheets of the  
8 Amended Site Plan. He said Jane Bakes is fully submitted to the Planning Board and he would  
9 like that to be considered too, but it is seen in steps and considered separate efforts. The  
10 Amended Site Plan is their first task this evening and what was proposed. He said comments had  
11 been received, with regard to lack of clarity and some of the figures were inherent but explained  
12 their effort was to amend the building construction configuration to build the Visitor Center  
13 complex from what was proposed, and submitted a couple of years ago, to what they seek to get  
14 approved here with this process. He deferred to Ms. Robbins.

15  
16 Ms. Robbins said this had been approved, the date of which she could not recall. At that time, in  
17 addition to the Visitors Center, an addition was added, new construction to the building. She said  
18 there had been a proposal for a loading dock with entrance the side of the building. Also, there  
19 was to add a small addition to Janes Backes, which was 800 sf. She said it was approved, with  
20 conditions, and it was allowed for construction to begin. There were some issues with the grading  
21 and curbing and they decided to not go forward with the entrance on one side of the building.  
22 With Janes Bakes, she said wanted to go larger, and, going forward, they want to work out some  
23 of the kinks with the Visitors Center. At the time of the Janes Bakes, she said all they had was a  
24 footprint, basically approving an addition that could be in that location, but there was really no  
25 retail. A new application for Janes Bakes was since been submitted, which is a 2500 sf addition,  
26 and the other entrance has been removed. She said they basically have modified the approval of

1 what was given them in the past. The size of the building has increased, and they got rid of the  
2 other entrance, plus they had to deal with additional work, which she said Mr. Fitzgerald would  
3 explain.

4  
5 Mr. Fitzgerald said there were some issues related to pedestrian facilities and ADA compliance  
6 with ramp grades and some locations. He said some of those areas were removed from  
7 circulation and it was one of the areas that went up to the loading dock.. He said bollards would  
8 be put in and it would be chained off, with another area of sidewalk along the building that will  
9 be closed off to the public. He has not seen it yet but said some of the curb ramps have been  
10 replaced that were not in compliance, to now be in compliance with the required railing, based on  
11 the grades. He said they are in the process of adding the railing. With the parking lot itself, he  
12 said with the circulation, the busses dropping off potential is still there. The way it got built out,  
13 he said, just did not facilitate what the intended use was. Some modifications have been added to  
14 that. It is not all in place yet, but he thinks the plan presented now shows the viable concept of  
15 having appropriate circulation, aisle access for parking, circulation for buses that may come  
16 through, and circulation for fire apparatus to get up closer to the building. He added that all those  
17 are positive things for the plan. A few field reviews have been done and he said comments made.  
18 The comments were transmitted to Mr. Nitza's office, and he has been in the field with him and  
19 the applicant to go through these things. There is a clear understanding now of what needs to be  
20 done. He said some of it has been done and some of it still needs to be done, but this last plan is  
21 good representation of what remains to be done. He said he hasn't had a chance to review it in  
22 detail, but he will, and his final comments will be offered to that regard.

23  
24 Mr. Campbell asked if the actual perimeter was being increased for the Jane Bakes building and  
25 will it expand out towards the parking lot. Mr. Fitzgerald said No, there is already a foundation, a  
26 patio there and the building itself is not expanding into the parking lot. Mr. Campbell asked if the

1 patio was a foundation to accommodate the addition. Mr. Nitza responded, saying that first, he  
2 appreciated the Town professionals helping to get this compliant and the Visitor Center is part of  
3 that. He told Mr. Campbell that there is an existing patio, much like Sloop, that is intended for  
4 seating in that area, which has ben designated as a raised patio. He said that area would be used  
5 for the expansion, and it will have to be cut into, for foundation footers. That patio area now that  
6 is right next to the building, and not in the parking area, will be raised up for an enclosed space  
7 of additional production; it is warehouse and no additional retail with the addition. Mr. Campbell  
8 said then the edge of the patio would be cut out, they will dig down, put footings in. Mr. Arco  
9 said the size will be the same. Mr. Nitza said it is within a foot and there is a little encroachment  
10 both ways with whichever way it is looked at, but that is the effort. Mr. Campbell asked how  
11 long the patio had been exposed to the weather. Mr. Nitza replied that he would say 2-3 years.

12  
13 Mr. Bryant said there were trucks there with the original building and Mr. Nitza replied that the  
14 former use of the building was for loading and unloading liquids. The patio area was the truck  
15 loading/unloading station scale. Mr. Bryant said there was gravel and it was already a structure;  
16 he would suggest they take a look at the record. Mr. Nitza responded Yes.

17  
18 Ms. Bledsoe asked what the additional space would be used for. Mr. Nitza replied that, right  
19 now, there is a small retail portion and most of it is production. It is cut up in 2 different areas.  
20 There is a mixing area to be seen through a window if in the retail area. In the back there is a  
21 freezer, extruder equipment, packaging equipment and all the in-going and out-going materials.  
22 He explained that the expansion will be empty space and one of the freezers that is there now  
23 will be moved into that space. There will be a second freezer and he said the rest of the floor  
24 spaces will be used for placing the equipment, extruders, packaging; for more efficient  
25 production. The retail space will stay the same. The in and out materials will still be on the north  
26 side but with the more space they will be able to double the unit production; 2 mixers instead of



1 one, 2 extruders instead of one 2 freezers, and so on. Ms. Bledsoe said the picture shows a rolling  
2 garage door and she asked what it was. Mr. Nitza said, on the south side, the entrance is because  
3 the owner of Janes Bakery (Jane) wants to have a lot of air circulation. The garage door is  
4 intended to open up, with screening, or not, to allow air flow through there. He said, from time to  
5 time, it will allow a piece of equipment to come in and out. The drawings show a person door, to  
6 be used for going in and out, but he said the larger door is mostly for employee comfort. Mr.  
7 Campbell asked if this affects the requirement for employee parking, with the addition. Mr. Nitza  
8 responded that additional spaces have been added, but it is not much, as it is all production area  
9 and the ratios for that are pretty low.

10  
11 Ms. Robbins said the site plan had been modified before the conditions were met for their first  
12 approval. This was a little problem and the Zoning Board asked that the site plan be updated, to  
13 reflect all the changes that were being asked of them with regard to the site. Then, she said, the  
14 Resolution for Approval would just have to be amended to reflect the reviewed plan. Mr.  
15 Campbell said then this stage of construction has not been started, technically, and they are just  
16 making the improvements to do this. Mr. Nitza said, from his perspective, there are 2 things  
17 going on. Janes Bakes the construction as not yet been started. They are going through the  
18 approvals and making sure their ducks are all in a row for that. The other issue is all of the  
19 outstanding issues for the Visitor Center itself. Some of it is hard, the ramps, curbs done and  
20 some of it is the paperwork and some of it is the site plan. He said he is currently working on  
21 that, and Ms. Robbins has been a big help to point them in the right way. He said her suggestion  
22 was to address the amended site plan first and, at almost the same time is the Jane Bakes  
23 construction project.

24  
25 Mr. Bryant said a bond was in place for the Visitor Center and, in his opinion, it should not hold  
26 up Jane Bakes. Mr. Campbell asked if a bond was in place for the other ancillary things. Mr.

1 Bryant said Correct. Mr. Fitzgerald asked if Jane Bakes came into the amended site plan, or  
2 would it be separate. Ms. Robbins replied that the 800 sf was part of the site pan and now the  
3 building is 800 sf and he is showing the footprint of it. Jane Bakes already went to the ARC and  
4 got approval, and she thinks the site plan is close. She said it is up to the Board how they want to  
5 proceed and if Jane Bakes will go off in the process. Then it would be known that the Visitor  
6 Center plan shows the footprint for Jane Bakes. Mr. Bryant suggested that there be No C.O. for  
7 Jane Bakes until everything is completed with the Visitor Center.

8  
9 Mr. Eickman said they are looking to amend the original resolution, to allow for the expansion,  
10 subject to the conditions of all of the things discussed by Mr. Fitzgerald and with the  
11 understanding that there would be no C.O until everything has been done.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Craig Arco, for the**  
17 **Amendment of original Site Plan for the iPark Visitor Center approval dated**  
18 **8/1/20 to accommodate the expansion of the Jane Bakes space, subject to all of the**  
19 **conditions of items discussed by the Traffic Engineer, and further subject to the**  
20 **condition that a Certificate of Occupancy would not be issued until everything**  
21 **has been completed. Voted and carried unanimously.**

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 **SKETCH PLAN:**

28  
29 **14. #2022- 033 – Stormville Run Subdivision, Stormville Road (6557-02-**  
30 **711619/793545)**

31  
32 Applicant is proposing a 30 lot subdivision of a 48.7 acre lot.

1 Michael E. Gillespie, Engineer, M. Gillespie Consulting & Associates was present for the  
2 applicant.

3  
4 The plan was displayed, and Mr. Gillespie stated he had done a presentation to the Board about 2  
5 months before for this piece that is about a 40-acres, across the road from the golf course. The lot  
6 count sits at 30 and he said they are present this evening for a secondary Discussion and  
7 additional feedback for the application. One of the major concerns had been the maximum road  
8 length. There had been a suggestion and a loop road was made, that came in off of Stormville  
9 and the cul-de-sac was extended to a maximum length of 1000 ft. He said this is probably the  
10 largest modification to the plan since the Board saw the last one. He said in Mr. Fitzgerald's  
11 letter the idea is to allow for a future connection and maybe allow for an existing right of way to  
12 be dedicated at the end portion, an easement or whatever it may be, so that when the other parcel  
13 comes on the line there is the continuous flow through each of these parcels. He said that is the  
14 proposal and they are looking to move further along with the Town.

15  
16 Ms. Robbins said that this has one less lot and Mr. Gillespie said that he wanted to say Yes. Ms.  
17 Robbins said her one comment Section 163 19D which talks about the side lot lines should be  
18 meeting at right angles unless there is a better lot design, and these are a little wacky so they  
19 should be cleaned up for the actual submission. She said it could give them a lot of problems  
20 later on if the are not. Mr. Gillespie said this is a sketch and that, obviously, there will be some  
21 advancement for the drawings at the point of formal application. He said he will keep this in  
22 mind. Ms. Robbins said there are still a lot of lots with access to Stormville Road and at least 8  
23 lots. Mr. Gillespie said Yes, 8 or 9. Ms. Robbins said there was the comment that if any of the  
24 property gets developed in the future, around this area, that a future connection may want to be  
25 considered to a road, so this property has a connection to it., and the cumulative impacts should  
26 be talked about in the SEQR. Mr. Gillespie said he understands.

1 Mr. Arco asked what lot would be impacted by the extension; was it off the cul-de-sac. Ms  
2 Robbins replied that it could be a couple of them. Mr. Gillespie said, if that gets extended and  
3 there is a right of way there, re-configuring will have to be done. He reiterated that this is a  
4 sketch plan, but it would be more formal. Mr. Arco asked if it would be seen soon. Ms. Robbins  
5 replied that this is their second sketch and there can only be 2 sketch plans and then a formal  
6 submission is done. At that point, she said it would come in as a Discussion. She told Mr.  
7 Gillespie he could reconfigure this and have a Discussion offline with staff. She is concerned  
8 about the 8 lots off of Stormville Road and she does not think this is a typical design.

9  
10 Ms. Bledsoe said it was talked about that, instead of the loop, extending the road more or less  
11 parallel to Stormville Road and create it being more of a neighborhood feel, versus some random  
12 lots off of Stormville Road, and then a cul-de-sac. She said then this would actually creating a  
13 neighborhood. The one lot that sites in between the loop road, their backyard backs up to  
14 someone else's backyard because, she assumes, they are going to face the loop. She added that  
15 she thinks this is a very odd layout for a lot and this seems very disjointed. Mr. Gillespie told her  
16 he thinks that when they submitted the cul-de-sac a little longer, it would have been more  
17 conducive to what she is talking about. In terms of the long cul-de-sac, they are trying to fit  
18 within the regulations; there are major cuts and major fills, so they will have to take a look at it.  
19 He said this layout is trying to meet the maximum cul-de-sac length, but there are other things  
20 that can be taken into consideration. He said the wetlands haven't been flagged yet and they are  
21 working around what is online and available. There will be an impact on lot count, layout, and  
22 road area as well. In term of the individual lots, he said that lately they have, even with the state  
23 access points, they have been limiting the access points to a shared entry. The curb cuts are  
24 actually on the road itself and he said sight line distances have to be provided, with all the  
25 information that it is safe. He motioned that Stormville is a little all over the place and this will

1 dictate the locations of the driveways and homes themselves. The idea was always to have the  
2 shared entrances to limit the access points.

3  
4 Ms. Robbins asked Mr. Gillespie if a cluster subdivision had been considered for this site and he  
5 replied that there is not the provision for water and sewer here. The back side abuts the water  
6 supply and sewer for Four Corners but, between this one and that, and he said there is a  
7 monstrous wetland. He said they would have to get to that to 216, loop around and come down to  
8 wrap it around. Ms. Robbins commented that then it would have to go through the wetland to  
9 connect to the water and Mr. Gillespie said that is right. Mr. Miyoshi said where the loop road  
10 comes out there is a wetland right alongside that; it looks to him that, where it comes out on  
11 Stormville Road, it is on the bad corner and would have to be moved. Mr. Gillespie said those  
12 things have to be looked at and there is a small federal wetland there, not Town or State, but  
13 things that have to get on the plan to move forward. Mr. Miyoshi stated that a lot of homes use  
14 that wetland as their well and Mr. Gillespie said he would look deeper into this.

15  
16 Ms. Bledsoe asked the lot sizes to extend the loop further and come out way down further on the  
17 other side and said that way it would create more. Mr. Fitzgerald said that potentially lots could  
18 be put on both sides of the road. Mr. Gillespie replied that this could be looked at potentially, so  
19 the new road would be parallel. He said he looks at the steep slopes maps, wetlands maps and  
20 buffer maps as part of their later submissions but if the Board determines that having some  
21 disturbance on the steep slopes is a benefit to allow for a longer road, it will have to be looked at  
22 to move forward because there is definitely an impact on those things. Ms. Bledsoe said that can  
23 be talked about and she just thinks that it is creating a neighborhood where all the houses are in  
24 the same road configuration, versus one cul-de-sac and a bunch of lots on Stormville Road.  
25 Shared driveways aside, she does not think it is about the curb cuts; it is about creating a  
26 development versus a bunch of random houses on a road.

1  
2 There were no further comments from the Board or Professionals.

3  
4 Mr. Gillespie thanked the Board, saying he appreciates the comments and will be back.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **CORRESPONDENCE:**  
11  
12

13 15. #2019- 023 – **Villa Nigrelli**, 109 Carpenter Road (6557-01-235639)  
14

15 Applicant is requesting to the Planning Board rescind the site plan approval granted  
16 2/28/19. Applicant has elected not to proceed with proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> floor expansion or  
17 improvements to the parking area. The second story will revert to storage only.  
18

19 Mr. Eickman said there was a Resolution that he thinks describes the situation well and he  
20 proceeded to read the Resolution.  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 **RESOLUTION RESCINDING AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR**  
26 **VILLA NIGRELLI**  
27

28 Name of Site Plan:	<b><u>Amended Site Plan for Villa Nigrelli</u></b>
29 Name of Applicant:	<b><u>109 Carpenter Road, LLC.</u></b>
30 Site Address:	<b><u>109 Carpenter Road, Hopewell</u></b>
31	<b><u>Junction, NY</u></b>
32 Grid no:	<b><u>6557-01-235639</u></b>
33	

34 Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member **John Eickman**  
35

1       **WHEREAS**, the applicant received amended site plan approval on 9/17/19 for the above  
2 project as represented on a site plan map entitled "Villa Nigrelli Amended Site Plan" prepared by  
3 MA Day Engineering, PC, dated September 17, 2019 and last revised August 15, 2019; and  
4

5       **WHEREAS**, the applicant subsequently decided not to move forward with the planned  
6 improvements which included restaurant space on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and parking lot improvements;  
7 and

8       **WHEREAS**, the applicant sent an email dated 5/16/22 to the Planning Board requesting  
9 that the above referenced amended site plan approval be rescinded; and  
10

11       **WHEREAS**, the applicant further requests that the approved site plan revert back to the  
12 previously approved site plan which allowed storage only on the second floor; and  
13

14       **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby rescinds  
15 the final amended site plan approval granted on 9/17/19 for the above project as represented on a  
16 map entitled "Villa Nigrelli Amended Site Plan" prepared by MA Day Engineering, PC, dated  
17 February 28, 2019 and last revised August 15, 2019; and  
18

19       **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of  
20 this Resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a  
21 copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.  
22

23       **Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member**

**Rich Campbell**

24  
25  
26  
27       The votes were as follows:

28       Board Member Lori Gee	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
29       Board Member Craig Arco	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
30       Board Member Ed Miyoshi	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
31       Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
32       Board Member Richard Campbell	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
33       Board Member Donald Papae	<b><u>Aye</u></b>
34       Chairperson John Eickman	<b><u>Aye</u></b>

**16. #2021-014 – Project Niagara/Rolling Frito-Lay Sales, LP** 10-350  
North Drive (6356-04-861300, 6356-04-950353, 6456,03-054349).

**\*Ms. Robbins stated that another Resolution would be added to the agenda :See Stone Ridge Commons, after Project Niagara.\***

Mr. Eickman said that Project Niagara would be taken first, and he proceeded to read the Resolution

**AMENDED RESOLUTION OF FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL**

**NAME OF SITE PLAN: Project Niagara**

**NAME OF APPLICANT: Rolling Frito-Lay Sales, LP**

**LOCATION: 10-350 North Drive**

**GRID NUMBERS: p/o 6356-04-861300, 6356-04-950353 and p/o 6456-03-054349**

Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member **John Eickman**

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board granted Final Site Plan Approval to Rolling Frito-Lay Sales, LP on 11/16/21, as shown on plans entitled, “*Site Plan Submission, East Fishkill Fulfillment Center*,” prepared by CHA dated 8/18/21, last revised November 9, 2021;



**WHEREAS**, the site plan approval was granted subject to endorsement of the Dutchess County Health Department; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant is actively working with the Town to complete the municipal water and sewer connections; and

**WHEREAS**, to prevent construction delays while the municipal sewer and water connections are finalized the applicant requests the Planning Board amend the site plan resolution to allow the applicant to obtain Dutchess County Health Department approval prior to the issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy instead of at site plan signature; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby amends the Final Site Plan Resolution for Rolling Frito-Lay Sales, LP as shown on plans entitled, “*Site Plan Submission, East Fishkill Fulfillment Center*,” prepared by CHA, last revised November 9, 2021 to permit the applicant to obtain Dutchess County Health Department approval prior to the issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of this Resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.

Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member **Richard Campbell**

Board Member Lori Gee	<b>Absent</b>
-----------------------	---------------

Board Member Craig Arco **Aye**

Board Member Ed Miyoshi **Aye**

Board Member Sarah Bledsoe **Aye**

Board Member Richard Campbell **Aye**

Board Member Donald Papae **Aye**

Chairperson John Eickman Aye

*\*Addition to Agenda:*

**STONE RIDGE COMMONS APARTMENTS**

**AMENDED RESOLUTION OF SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL PERMIT  
APPROVAL**

**NAME OF SITE PLAN: STONE RIDGE COMMONS APARTMENTS**

**NAME OF APPLICANT: 1525 Route 52 Partners LLC**

**LOCATION: Route 52 and Palen Road, Hopewell Junction, NY**

**GRID NUMBERS: 132800-6356-04-731304/776321**

**Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member John Eickman**

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board granted Special Permit and Site Plan approval to the site plan titled “Stone Ridge Commons Apartments” prepared by Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C., dated 9/27/19 and last revised 4/19/21; and

**WHEREAS**, the Stone Ridge Commons Apartments will be serviced by municipal water and sewer; and

1       **WHEREAS**, the special permit and site plan approval was granted subject to  
2 endorsement of the Dutchess County Health Department; and  
3

4       **WHEREAS**, the applicant is actively working with the Town to complete the municipal  
5 water and sewer connections; and  
6

7       **WHEREAS**, to prevent construction delays while the municipal sewer and water  
8 connections are finalized the applicant is requesting that the Planning Board amend the site plan  
9 resolution to allow the applicant to obtain Dutchess County Health Department approval prior to  
10 the issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy instead of at site plan signature; and  
11

12       **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby amends the  
13 Special Permit and Final Site Plan Resolution for “Stone Ridge Commons Apartments” as shown  
14 on plans entitled, “*Stone Ridge Commons*,” prepared by Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C., dated  
15 9/27/19 and last revised 4/19/21 to permit the applicant to obtain Dutchess County Health  
16 Department approval prior to the issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy; and  
17

18       **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of  
19 this Resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a  
20 copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.  
21

22 Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member   **Rich Campbell**  
23  
24

25 The votes were as follows:

26 Board Member Lori Gee                               **Absent**

27 Board Member Craig Arco                           **Aye**

28 Board Member Ed Miyoshi                          **Aye**

29 Board Member Sarah Bledsoe                      **Aye**

30 Board Member Richard Campbell                  **Aye**

Board Member Donald Papae Aye

Chairperson John Eickman Aye

**\*Addition to Agenda\***

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

**COMMUNITY CENTER, White Pond Road, Stormville**

Ms. Robbins said a request had been received from the Community Center, White Pond Road, Stormville, which is a community building in the Town, used for a theater group. The request is for a minor site plan amendment to install a handicapped access ramp. She said it could be handled by the Building Department and that she was making the Board aware. Because it is a handicapped ramp, she said it is ADA for disabilities and any handicapped ramp has setbacks in the Town Code; it will need a setback variance through the Building Department. Mr. Eickman asked if handicapped parking spaces would also be created or if they had these. Ms. Robbins replied that there are handicapped spaces in the front and the building. She also stated that the building has some Fire Code issues that will be dealt with. Mr. Campbell asked if this was impinging on the existing parking and Ms. Robbins replied no, it is not going into their existing parking; it is right in front of the building.

**MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to Amend the Site Plan for the Community Center, allowing a new ADA handicapped ramp for the building. Voted and carried unanimously.**

Mr. Eickman confirmed that there was no other business to be brought before the Planning Board this evening. He stated that, without objection, he declared the meeting to be Adjourned.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION made by John Eickman, seconded by Richard Campbell, to adjourn the Planning Board meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.**

**Respectfully submitted:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Kathleen Mahodil, Meeting Secretary**  
**East Fishkill Planning Board**